

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments, and the following remarks. Claims 8 and 15-17 are in the application. Claims 1-7 and 9-14 have been canceled, and claims 8, 15, and 16 have been amended. Claim 17 has been added. No new matter has been introduced

Claims 8 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Arai et al. Claims 10 and 16 were rejected as being unpatentable over Arai et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.


Claim 8 has been amended to include all of the features of original claims 1 and 7, which the Examiner indicated were allowable, both in the office action of August 20, 2007, and in an email exchange between the Examiner and the Applicant on April 15-18, 2008. Claim 17 has been added to include all of the features of original claims 1 and 7. These features are not taught or suggested by Arai et al.

In Arai, the pixel values of different channels are coupled, but not different pixels in the neighborhood, as is done in the

present invention, by spatially coupling the pixels. Only by the present invention are image errors such as blur and geometric distortions or dynamic color errors (divergence) corrected. Also, space variance of correction parameters are considered by the present invention.

Because all of the claims are now based on the allowable subject matter from the canceled claims 1 and 7, allowance of said claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Bernd MICHAELIS ET AL




COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

Elizabeth C. Richter, Reg.No.35,103
Attorney for Applicants

ECR:cmm

I hereby certify that the forgoing response was filed electronically in the USPTO on April 30, 2008.



Elizabeth C. Richter